

Approved For Release 2001/03/02 : CIA-RDP70-00058R000200120158-2

can hope for a restoration of the comparative advantage to an extent in agricultural trade. We should the principle of comparative advantage in the production of European farm products.

I refer to one more problem, without which I have exhausted the list. This is the problem of import competition from extremely low-wage areas where modern technology is in use, such as Japan, Hong Kong and perhaps India. The problem is that international trade has not adjusted to the existence of a strong comparative advantage in the production of particular items in particular areas. In the low-wage countries the average level of productivity is relatively low, but productivity in a few industries—textiles, chemicals, transistor radios—may be nearly as high as the best in the world. There are several reasons for failure to adjust to such comparative advantages. The advantage has been partially developed in some cases. In other cases it has only recently reemerged since the war. In many cases the adjustment has been postponed for a long time by quotas and tariffs. The problem is accentuated in some countries, and this includes the United States, have been much more liberal than others in accepting the products of these low-wage areas, with the result that the burden of adjustment is concentrated on them.

I think we cannot permanently refuse efficient producers access to our markets. The adjustment of our markets to trade liberalization in the approach I am suggesting will ease the process of adjustment. Also, I suggest trade barriers are reduced by the members of the area the burden of adjustment will be broadly distributed and not on any one country. Perhaps in some cases further measures will be needed to moderate the adjustment process. Whether this is so should be the subject of international consultation, and it is all too easy for each party to discover the need for its own protection.

Tariff Could Stimulate More Shrimp Fishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on August 8, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives held a hearing on various bills, including my own H.R. 6424, which would impose a 35 percent ad valorem duty on processed shrimp and limit duty-free entry of unprocessed shrimp annually in an amount equal to imports of shrimp in 1960. Because enactment of this legislation would preserve the domestic shrimp industry and open the door to expansion of Alaska's infant shrimp industry and because I am a sponsor of the legislation, I joined other witnesses in testifying in its support.

Most people are not aware of the vast shrimp potential of the States of the Pacific Northwest. Yet off the coasts of California, Oregon, Washington—and most particularly, Alaska—there exists a potential production which can equal or

excel the production of the Gulf and South Atlantic States. With an adequate market, Alaska's vast shrimp production capability, estimated at 100 million pounds annually, would some day be realized. Hence, it is not surprising that Alaskans take issue with those who oppose appropriate limitations on the import of foreign shrimp.

Accordingly, for the information of my colleagues, I submit a cogent editorial which appeared in the September 2 issue of the Anchorage Daily Times, and urge support of the legislation in question. The editorial follows.

TARIFF COULD STIMULATE MORE SHRIMP FISHING

Alaska's budding shrimp industry faces a bleak future if the trend in imports is allowed to continue.

The U.S. Tariff Commission apparently doesn't care. It has reported to Congress that Alaska shrimp are small in size and not in such quantity. There is reason to doubt the Tariff Commission was wrong.

Alaska's shrimp industry became shrimp-reliant in the past few years of the 1950s. It has been reported by fishermen.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has supported this view in reports on explorations in central Alaska around Kodiak Island and along the Pacific side of the Alaska Peninsula. Russian fishermen have noted the big shrimp resource in the Bering Sea. Japan is actively fishing for shrimp there. There are also shrimp in Prince William Sound and southeastern Alaska.

The Tariff Commission has taken a stand unfavorable to a quota system to protect the U.S. market from foreign imports. It has contended that a limitation would preclude development of shrimp processing for lack of adequate supplies of raw shrimp.

Without a quota, there is reason to fear that foreign imports will swamp the U.S. market with ruinous results to all American fishermen.

The domestic market has tripled since shrimp were declared duty free in 1930. In that period, domestic production has increased some, but not as rapidly as imports. Foreign nations supplied 18 percent of U.S. market requirements in 1931, 36 percent in 1957 and an estimated 50 percent in 1959. The number of foreign suppliers increased from 10 countries to 30, and is still rising.

Proponents of the shrimp tariff and quota bill contend that they seek a sound basis for future development. They say it will assure a stable market that will benefit both domestic and foreign suppliers.

Alaska could capture a commanding position in an important industry if her shrimp resources were developed.

Shrimp is now the most valuable seafood caught by U.S. fishermen. Operations in Alaska could produce values in excess of those in the salmon industry.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has published reports showing Alaska shrimp are plentiful and that they tempt and tantalize the palate of the average man as well as the gourmet. Nowhere has the service corroborated the statement of the Tariff Commission that they are suitable only for cooking.

Those engaged in shrimp processing and marketing have told Congress that the potential for shrimp production in Alaska "is substantially larger in pounds than the entire domestic shrimp landings in the Gulf and Atlantic fisheries combined." The Alaska catch rates and potential have been termed inequipped anywhere in the world.

Alaskans constantly talk about broadening the base for their fishing industry. They

Central Intelligence Agency: A Guardian of the National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the September issue of *Firing Line*, published by the American Legion, contains an article entitled "Central Intelligence Agency: A Guardian of Our National Security." The Central Intelligence Agency is an organization of which little is really known; but from what I know of it, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and through my personal contact with many members of that Agency, I believe it has rendered outstanding service for the United States.

I have for 30 years known Allen Dulles, Director of the CIA, who occasionally comes under strong criticism. If something happens to go wrong, the blame is often placed upon him, as it was in the case of the Cuban invasion fiasco. From what I know of that action, I do not believe the blame belongs on his shoulders. However, he is a man who never says anything to defend himself. For that reason, he is apt to bear a large amount of unjust criticism. I rate him a brave, dedicated, and brilliant American with a long record of distinguished service to the United States.

The article about the Central Intelligence Agency, published in *Firing Line*, gives an excellent appraisal of that organization. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY: A GUARDIAN OF OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

A strategic bulwark in the United States, life and death struggle against the increasing imperialistic threat of international Soviet communism is the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). Established in 1947 under the provisions of the National Security Act as a successor of the Central Intelligence Group, the CIA is primarily responsible for coordinating the intelligence activities of certain Federal departments and agencies in the interest of protecting the security of the Nation. Among its other important duties, CIA is charged with creating and evaluating intelligence relating to the national security, and providing for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government.